

PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD'S DECISION

APPELLANT: Peter Matthews  
DOCKET NO.: 04-22886.001-C-1  
05-20918.001-C-1  
PARCEL NO.: 03-20-202-012

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board (hereinafter PTAB) are Peter Matthews, the appellant, by attorney Brian P. Liston with the law firm of Liston & Lafakis in Chicago and the Cook County Board of Review.

The subject property consists of a 26,250 square foot parcel of land improved with a one-story, masonry constructed, gas station and convenience store with 1,436 square feet of building area. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the basis of this appeal.

The PTAB finds that these appeals are within the same assessment triennial, involve common issues of law and fact and a consolidation of the appeals would not prejudice the rights of the parties. Therefore, under the *Official Rules of the Property*

(Continued on Next Page)

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a reduction in the assessment of the property as established by the Cook County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

<u>DOCKET #</u>	<u>PIN</u>	<u>LAND</u>	<u>IMPRVMNT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
04-22886.001-C-1	03-20-202-012	\$84,787	\$48,213	\$133,000
05-20918.001-C-1	03-20-202-012	\$84,787	\$48,213	\$133,000

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

PTAB/0585JBV

Docket No. 04-22886.001-C-1  
05-20918.001-C-1

*Tax Appeal Board, Section 1910.78*, the PTAB consolidates the above appeals.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal of the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2004. The appraiser used the sales comparison approach to value to arrive at market value of \$350,000. The appraiser determined that the highest and best use to be its current use.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser utilized four suggested comparable sales located in the same market as the subject. The comparables consist of one-story, masonry, gasoline stations. The properties range: in age from 23 to 52 years with one age unknown; in improvement size from 250 to 2,800 square feet of building area; in land size from 21,600 to 43,560 square feet; and in land to building ratio from 8.64:1 to 144:1. The properties sold from October 2001 to October 2002 for prices ranging from \$380,000 to \$695,000 or from \$12.05 to \$19.25 per square foot of land. The appraiser made several adjustments to the comparables. Based on this, the appraiser determined the subject property's value using the sales comparison approach to be \$350,000 rounded.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$185,423. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$487,955 using the level of assessment of 38% for Class 5A property as contained in the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. The board also submitted raw sale information for 11 properties suggested as comparable to the subject. These comparables are all located within the subject's market and are improved with one-story, masonry, mixed construction or concrete, gasoline stations. These buildings range: in age from three to 54 years with four ages unknown; in improvement size from 500 to 4,800 square feet of building area; and in land size from 16,749 to 29,844 square feet. The comparables sold from March 2002 to December 2003 for prices ranging from \$380,000 to \$2,500,000 or from \$16.94 to \$115.98 per square foot of land.

The board of review also included a handwritten grid of 23 properties with comments written on the grid. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the evidence and reviewing the record, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

When overvaluation is claimed the appellant has the burden of proving the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dist. 2000). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arm's length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.65(c). Having considered the evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the PTAB finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The appellant's appraiser utilized the sales comparison approach to value in determining the subject's market value. The PTAB finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraiser: has experience in appraising; personally inspected the subject property and reviewed the property's history; estimated a highest and best use for the subject property; utilized appropriate market data in undertaking the sales comparison approach to value; and lastly, used similar properties while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as adjustments that were necessary. The PTAB gives little weight to the board of review's comparables as the information provided was raw sales data with no adjustments made. The PTAB also give no weight to the board of review's handwritten grid because the board of review provided unexplained information.


Therefore, the PTAB finds that the subject property contained a market value of \$350,000 for the 2004 assessment triennial. Since the market value of the subject has been established, the Cook County Real Property Classification Ordinance level of assessments for Cook County Class 5A property of 38% will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$133,000 while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount at \$185,423. Therefore, the PTAB finds that a reduction is warranted.

Docket No. 04-22886.001-C-1  
05-20918.001-C-1

This is a final administrative decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board which is subject to review in the Circuit Court or Appellate Court under the provisions of the Administrative Review Law (735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.) and section 16-195 of the Property Tax Code.



Chairman



Member



Member

Member

Member

DISSENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

As Clerk of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board issued this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this said office.

Date: February 29, 2008



Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code provides in part:

"If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel after the deadline for filing

Docket No. 04-22886.001-C-1  
05-20918.001-C-1

complaints with the Board of Review or after adjournment of the session of the Board of Review at which assessments for the subsequent year are being considered, the taxpayer may, within 30 days after the date of written notice of the Property Tax Appeal Board's decision, appeal the assessment for the subsequent year directly to the Property Tax Appeal Board."

In order to comply with the above provision, YOU MUST FILE A PETITION AND EVIDENCE WITH THE PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ENCLOSED DECISION IN ORDER TO APPEAL THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

Based upon the issuance of a lowered assessment by the Property Tax Appeal Board, the refund of paid property taxes is the responsibility of your County Treasurer. Please contact that office with any questions you may have regarding the refund of paid property taxes.